

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

10/820,568 04/07/2004 Leomard Forbes MI22-2481 8561 21567 7590 10/24/2005 EXAMINER WELLS ST. JOHN P.S. NGUYEN, VIET Q 601 W. FIRST AVENUE, SUITE 1300 SPOK ANE WA 00201	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
WELLS ST. JOHN P.S. 601 W. FIRST AVENUE, SUITE 1300	10/820,568	04/07/2004	Leornard Forbes	MI22-2481	8561
601 W. FIRST AVENUE, SUITE 1300	21567	7590 10/24/200		EXAMINER	
				NGUYEN, VIET Q	
	601 W. FIRST	AVENUE, SUITE	300		
		•		2827	•

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Response to Rule 312 Communication Application No. 10/820,568 FORBES, LEORNAR	;	
Examiner Viet Q. Nguyen 2827 The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence add The amendment filed on 31 August 2005 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been: a) Entered. b) entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention. c) disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee. Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) disapproved. See explanation below. e) entered in part. See explanation below. V.N 10/17/2005 Note: The examiner agrees with the applicant's remarks concerning the last examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance", and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPE 1302.1-17 Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312.	Applicant(s) FORBES, LEORNARD	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence add The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence add The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence add The amendment filed on 31 August 2005 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been: a) □ entered. b) □ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention. c) □ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee. Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) □ disapproved. See explanation below. v. Note: The examiner agrees with the applicant's remarks concerning the last examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance", and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPEP 1302.12 Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312.		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence add □ The amendment filed on 31 August 2005 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been: a) □ entered. b) □ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention. c) □ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee. Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) □ disapproved. See explanation below. e) □ entered in part. See explanation below. V.N 10/17/2005 Note: The examiner agrees with the applicant's remarks concerning the last examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance", and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPEP 1302.14). Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312.		
 ☑ The amendment filed on 31 August 2005 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been: a) ☑ entered. b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention. c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee. Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below. e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below. V.N. 10/17/2005 Note: The examiner agrees with the applicant's remarks concerning the last examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance", and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPEP 1302.12 Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312. 		
a) ⊠ entered. b) □ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention. c) □ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee. Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) □ disapproved. See explanation below. e) □ entered in part. See explanation below. V.N 10/17/2005 Note: The examiner agrees with the applicant's remarks concerning the last examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance", and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPEP 1302.14 Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312.	ress –	
 c) disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee. Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) disapproved. See explanation below. e) entered in part. See explanation below. V.N. 10/17/2005 Note: The examiner agrees with the applicant's remarks concerning the last examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance", and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPEP 1302.14). Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312. 		
Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) disapproved. See explanation below. e) entered in part. See explanation below. V.N. 10/17/2005 Note: The examiner agrees with the applicant's remarks concerning the last examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance", and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPEP 1302.14). Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312.		
e) entered in part. See explanation below. V.N 10/17/2005 Note: The examiner agrees with the applicant's remarks concerning the last examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance", and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPEP 1302.14). Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312.	1.313(c)(1	
V.N 10/17/2005 Note: The examiner agrees with the applicant's remarks concerning the last examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance", and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPEP 1302.14 Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312		
Note: The examiner agrees with the applicant's remarks concerning the last examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance", and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPEP 1302.14). Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312.	•	
Allowance, and that the allowed claims should be interpreted as only their literally wordings meant for (MPEP 1302.14 Thus, the last erronous reason statement is defective and now is withdrawn by the examiner per this enter of 312.		
	1).	

VIET Q. NGUYEN
TRIMARY EXAMINER

Viet Q. Nguyen

V-Nquella